

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 11-18 are presently active in this case, Claims 1, 8 and 14 having been amended and Claims 9 and 10 canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rick, et al., (US 2005/0078774, hereinafter "Rick"); and Claims 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rick in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

In light of the several grounds for rejection, Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention and thereby more clearly patentable define over the cited prior art references. To that end, Claim 1 has been amended consistent with the Figure 10 embodiment disclosed in the specification to clarify that the claimed frequency adjustment method includes, inter alia,

receiving a signal having a first signal and a second signal, the first signal having a short cycle time and the second signal having a long cycle time longer than the short cycle time;

detecting a deviation of a frequency of a the first signal contained in a the received signal and received signal delayed by a first delay time corresponding to the short cycle time;

detecting a deviation of a frequency of a the second signal contained in the received signal and the received signal delayed by a second delay time corresponding to the long cycle time;

determining a deviation of a frequency of the received signal on the basis of the detected deviation of the first signal and that of the second signal; and

adjusting the frequency of the received signal on the basis of the determined frequency deviation.

Claim 8 has been amended to state more detail than amended Claim 1, i.e., to include the subject matter of Claims 9 and 10, which have been canceled. Claim 15 has been

amended to include clarification about the relative delay of the recited first and second delays. No new matter has been added.

The applied Rick reference in paragraph 0012 and Figs. 1 and 3, is not believed to disclose or obviate the claimed invention. While the outstanding Office Action seems to rely on delay circuits attributed to Figs. 1 and 3 of Rick, Figs. 1 and 3 of Rick do not show any delay circuits and none are described in the Rick specification. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that Rick does not disclose or obviate the two detecting steps and the determining step recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present amendment to Claim 1 overcomes the outstanding rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rick. Withdrawal of this ground for rejection is therefore believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

For the same reason above noted, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claims 8 and 14 also are not anticipated by Rick. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of Claims 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is therefore also believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

In response to the rejection of Claims 7 and 13 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Rick and AAPA, Applicants point out that an OFDM signal itself is a well-known signal; however, it is not obvious from Rick and AAPA to process such signal as recited in Claims 1 and 8. Moreover, the structure in these claims has significant advantage insofar as high speed adjustment of a received frequency, which advantage cannot be obtained by merely combining Rick and AAPA. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 7 and 13 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Rick and AAPA has also been overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

The remaining dependent Claims 2-7, 11-12 and 15-18 are believed to be patentably distinguishing, at the very least by virtue of dependency on a patentably distinguishing independent claim.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\EHK\25's\250324\250324US-AMENDMENT-2.24.08.DOC